IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

LEONARD CHASE, JR., No. 4:18-CV-00101

Petitioner, (Chief Judge Brann)

v. (Magistrate Judge Carlson)

SCI ALBION, et al.,

Respondents.

ORDER

OCTOBER 29, 2021

Leonard Chase, Jr., a Pennsylvania state prisoner, filed this 28 U.S.C. § 2254 petition seeking to vacate his convictions and sentence based upon constitutional violations that allegedly occurred during his trial. In September 2021, Magistrate Judge Martin C. Carlson issued a Report and Recommendation recommending that this Court deny the petition, as Chase's claims are either procedurally defaulted or otherwise without merit. Chase filed timely objections to this Report and Recommendation; those objections primarily relate to Chase's contention that he was improperly convicted of numerous counts of robbery.

"If a party objects timely to a magistrate judge's report and recommendation, the district court must 'make a de novo determination of those portions of the report

¹ Doc. 1.

² Doc. 17.

³ Doc. 18.

or specified proposed findings or recommendations to which objection is made.""4

Regardless of whether timely objections are made, district courts may accept, reject,

modify—in whole or in part—the magistrate judge's findings or

recommendations.⁵ After reviewing the record, the Court finds no error in Magistrate

Judge Carlson's conclusion that Chase's claims are either procedurally defaulted or

without merit. Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

Magistrate Judge Martin C. Carlson's Report and Recommendation 1.

(Doc. 17) is **ADOPTED**;

Chase's 28 U.S.C. § 2254 petition (Doc. 1) is **DENIED**; 2.

The Court declines to issue certificate of appealability;⁶ and 3.

4. The Clerk of Court is directed to **CLOSE** this case.

BY THE COURT:

s/Matthew W. Brann

Matthew W. Brann

Chief United States District Judge

Equal Emp't Opportunity Comm'n v. City of Long Branch, 866 F.3d 93, 99 (3d Cir. 2017) (quoting 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)).

²⁸ U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); Local Rule 72.31.

See Slack v. McDaniel, 529 U.S. 473, 484 (2000) (setting forth legal standard).